

Remarks/Arguments

Amendments to the Claims and New Claims

The claim amendments and the new claims are fully supported by the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to Claims 7-9, 11-13, 15, 19, and 20 under 37 CFR 1.75(c).

Applicants have cancelled Claims 19 and 20. Applicants amended Claim 2 to delete the limitation: "wherein the at least one protective layer (4), at least in portions, is on the elastically deformable material of the core," Therefore, Claims 7, 8, 11, and 12 provide further limiting of the subject matter in Claim 2. Applicants have amended Claims 9, 13, and 15 to depend from Claim 2. Therefore, Claims 9, 13, and 15 provide further limiting of the subject matter in Claim 2.

Applicants courteously request that the objection be removed.

The Rejection of Claims 2, 3, 7, and 19 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected Claims 2, 3, 7, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 3,215,442 (Papenguth). Applicants traverse the rejection as follows.

Anticipation requires that all of the elements of the claim be taught within the four corners of a single reference.

Claim 2

Amended Claim 2 recites: "wherein the at least one protective layer (4) covers the center section and at least a portion of the first or second wing sections"

Applicants respectfully submit that the recitation of covering an item implicitly includes, and in fact requires, completely covering the item. If the intention of the limitation were to exclude the requirement to fully cover the center section, it would be necessary to explicitly

recite that the protective layer partially covers the center section.

The Examiner cited Fig. 9 of Papenguth as teaching the protective layer (body 11 or ring 40), center section (part 34), and wing sections (33/42) of Claim 2. However, ring 40 does not make contact with part 34 and body 11 only makes nominal contact with part 34. Therefore, neither body 11 nor ring 40 cover part 34.

Papenguth fails to teach all the elements of Claim 2; therefore, Claim 2 is novel with respect to Papenguth. Claims 3 and 7, dependent from Claim 2, also are novel with respect to Papenguth. Claim 19 has been cancelled.

New Claim 23

New Claim 23 recites: “wherein the at least one protective layer (4) covers the center section and at least a portion of the at least one wing section”

The arguments presented for Claim 2 are applicable to new Claim 23.

Papenguth fails to teach all the elements of Claim 23; therefore, Claim 23 is novel with respect to Papenguth.

New Claims 24 and 25

New Claim 24 and 25 each recite: “wherein the at least one protective layer (4) completely covers the center section”

Although Applicants submit that the recitation of covering an item implicitly includes, and in fact requires, completely covering the item, Applicants have added the explicitly recited limitation of “completely covers” to Claims 24 and 25. It is clear that body 11 in Papenguth does not completely cover part 34. In fact, body 11 only touches a small portion of part 34 near the juncture of part 34 with flange 33.

Papenguth fails to teach all the elements of Claims 24 and 25; therefore, Claims 24 and 25 are novel with respect to Papenguth.

New Claims 26 and 27

New Claim 26 recites: “wherein the at least one protective layer (4) covers a portion of the center section furthest from the ring plane along a line orthogonal to the ring plane”

New Claim 27 recites: “wherein the at least one protective layer (4) covers a portion of

the center section furthest from the first ring plane along a line orthogonal to the first ring plane”

That is, Claims 26 and 27 recite the protective layer covering the “crown” of the center section.

The Examiner cited Fig. 9 of Papenguth as teaching the protective layer (body 11 or ring 40), center section (part 34), and wing sections (33/42) of Claim 2. However, ring 40 does not make contact with part 34 and body 11 only makes nominal contact with part 34 near a wing section. Therefore, neither body 11 nor ring 40 covers the “crown” of part 34.

Papenguth fails to teach all the elements of Claims 26 and 27; therefore, Claims 26 and 27 are novel with respect to Papenguth.

Applicants courteously request that the rejection be removed.

The Rejection of Claims 4, 8, 9, 11-13, 15, and 20 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 4, 8, 9, 11-13, 15, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 3,215,442 (Papenguth). Applicants traverse the rejection as follows.

Applicants have shown that Papenguth does not teach all the limitations of Claim 2. Nor does Papenguth suggest or motivate all the limitations of Claim 2.

Papenguth fails to teach, suggest, or motivate all the elements of Claim 2; therefore, Claim 2 is patentable over Papenguth. Claims 4, 8, 9, 11-13, and 15, dependent from Claim 2, enjoy the same distinction with respect to Papenguth. Claim 20 has been cancelled.

Applicants courteously request that the rejection be removed.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, which action is courteously requested. The Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact the undersigned agent of record if such contact will facilitate an efficient examination and allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

/C. Paul Maliszewski/

C. Paul Maliszewski
Registration No. 51,990
Simpson & Simpson, PLLC
5555 Main Street
Williamsville, NY 14221-5406
Telephone No. 716-626-1564

CPM/
Dated: April 29, 2008